

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.654
17 June 1993

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 17 June 1993, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China)

GE.93-61260 (E)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I declare open the 654th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As the President of the Conference is out of town on official mission, in accordance with rule 10 of the rules of procedure I have the honour today of replacing him in his duties.

I have on the list of speakers of today the representatives of Malta and Cuba, and I give the floor to the representative of Malta, Mr. Valentino.

Mr. VALENTINO (Malta): Mr. President, allow me to begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency of this Conference and to assure you of my delegation's full cooperation and support. I wish you every success during your term as President of the Conference.

In my intervention today I would like to refer briefly to three aspects particularly - those related to the strengthening of the non-proliferation Treaty, transparency in armaments and the chemical weapons Convention.

The year 1995 will be an important year for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, an instrument which is vital for international peace, international security and overall global economic progress in the world. The effectiveness of the non-proliferation Treaty is seen as a universal treaty that impedes the spread of nuclear weapons and sets the mechanism for general and complete disarmament. The preparatory process for the 1995 review and extension conference of the non-proliferation Treaty should be an opportunity for States parties to redouble their efforts in attaining the objectives of non-proliferation and strengthen the non-proliferation Treaty. It is our view that the non-proliferation Treaty should be extended indefinitely, and that at the 1995 extension conference commitments be made by the nuclear Powers to reduce further their nuclear weapons and for non-nuclear Powers not to acquire these weapons. The nuclear-weapon States have the main responsibility for strengthening the non-proliferation Treaty and in the light of the Clinton-Yeltsin declaration take the opportunity to negotiate with urgency and in good faith a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Such a process would definitely facilitate in a positive manner the outcome of the 1995 non-proliferation Treaty conference. Banning tests will not guarantee that proliferation can be prevented. However, a test-ban treaty will help reduce incentives for proliferation.

Malta, a non-nuclear-weapon State, is equally interested in the pursuit of disarmament and its implications. With all other nations, we urge those States with military arsenals to intensify their efforts towards reduction of armaments and to build mutual confidence and trust which is the basis of this process. Such nations possessing military arsenals, be they nuclear or conventional, should keep in mind that the impact and the size of such arsenals remains a threat to the security of other States.

(Mr. Valentino, Malta)

A step forward in disarmament is a step forward for humanity. For those States not possessing nuclear weapons, adherence to the non-proliferation Treaty signifies in itself an act of faith in the implementation of the relevant provisions of the United Nations Charter. We strongly believe that all United Nations Member States have an obligation to humanity not to shake this faith.

At the last General Assembly, Malta welcomed regional development in the field of disarmament, including the ratification by the Government of DPRK of the safeguards agreement with IAEA, as well as the Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula made on 31 December 1991. This step forward was, however, reversed rather abruptly by the announcement by North Korea to withdraw from the NPT, which comes at a time when efforts are being made to strengthen the NPT. Malta would like to join other countries in urging the Government of the DPRK to reconsider its decision to withdraw from the NPT. In the meantime we take note with satisfaction of the outcome of the United States and the DPRK talks held recently in New York on this particular issue.

The chemical weapons Convention is a milestone towards general and complete disarmament, since it provides for the total elimination of a whole category of weapons of mass destruction. Progress has been made in the two preparatory commissions held in The Hague, and by the end of this year most of the work accomplished by the PrepCom will definitely advance the process for most States signatories to ratify the Convention at an early date. The threat of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is still real and with us, and the success of the preparatory phase for the entry into force of this Convention is determined by the participation of a large number of States signatories, including those which possess such weapons. We still remain concerned about the non-adherence of a number of States, particularly those from our region, to the chemical weapons Convention. The chemical weapons Convention remains in our view a standard instrument which could be a model instrument to other disarmament issues which the Conference on Disarmament has the potential to exploit as a negotiating body.

The third issue I wish to address is transparency in armaments and the arms register. With the ending of the cold war, increased importance had to be made on the need to control the transfer of conventional arms, particularly for those regions of tension and instability. At last year's session of the Conference on Disarmament, a new item was introduced as part of the agenda of the Conference on transparency in armaments, and this year we have rightly established an Ad Hoc Committee on this issue.

The establishment of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms, of which Malta in the 1960s was the original initiator at the United Nations General Assembly, was an important step to control international arms trade. In conformity with my Government's policy and objectives, at the forty-seventh United Nations General Assembly, Malta was co-sponsor of the resolution on

(Mr. Valentino, Malta)

transparency in armaments, which was adopted without a vote. In accordance with the provisions of this resolution, Malta has submitted its report. We urge others who have not yet done so to submit their reports. We need to build confidence to enhance transparency and, as stated by other delegations, hope that the Conference on Disarmament at its current session will provide a stimulus on this item. My delegation looks forward to further deliberations on this item. Although this item has been discussed recently within the Conference on Disarmament, it will be further examined in the future prior to the 1994 expert group which will have the task of studying the operation of the first phase of the Register and provide guidance for its expansion and further development. Needless to say, the establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on Transparency in Armaments is a timely and encouraging measure which will create the right ambiance for effective and concrete advancement in this specific area.

New challenges and opportunities are presenting themselves. Transparency in armaments is one of the most important items in which this year the Conference on Disarmament has an important role to play. Transparency in armaments would complement other discussions and negotiations taking place in other forums, including CSCE. My delegation hopes that the political will shown in the establishment of this and other measures will be enhanced and strengthened.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Malta for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba, Mrs. Bauta Solés.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Allow me first of all to congratulate you on the excellent work that Ambassador Leon and his delegation have performed in discharging the duties relating to the office of President of the Conference on Disarmament. In doing so I have in mind the excellent state of the relations our two countries have traditionally maintained.

I have asked for the floor this morning in order to read a statement by the Group of 21. I will read it in English. It deals with the subject of transparency in armaments, and reads as follows.

Last 4 March, the CD listened to a proposal by the United States on a data exchange exercise regarding the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. On 22 March, during an Ad Hoc Committee meeting on TIA, the G.21 set forth its position regarding the said proposal in the following statement read out by the Group Coordinator:

"Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Group of 21, I wish to make the following statement:

(Mrs. Bauta Solés, Cuba)

"The Group held a brief meeting today during the short break, to focus on the matters before us. It is the position of the members of the G.21 that given the importance of the proposal just made, the Group needs time to reflect upon the matter."

On 25 March, the CD took up the issue for consideration during an informal plenary meeting. On that occasion the G.21 Coordinator made the following statement:

"Mr. President, as Coordinator of G.21, I think it is my duty to report to this informal meeting the position of the G.21 on the matter under reference.

"Immediately after the matter was taken up in the Ad Hoc Committee on TIA last Monday (22 March 1993), the G.21 held a brief meeting to focus on many other matters including the proposal made by the United States.

"Subsequently my Ambassador, as mandated by the G.21, informed the Ad Hoc Committee on TIA that given the importance of this matter, members of the G.21 concluded that they need time to reflect upon it. I conveyed this position to the Presidential consultations yesterday (24 March 1993). Since then, there is no change to the position of members of the G.21."

That same day, the CD formal plenary was not able to recommend the proposal for consideration.

Since the G.21 statements, while not addressing the substance of the proposal, are also relevant to the decision taken, the Group requested the inclusion of the above-quoted statements in document CD/TIA/INF.2, since that document is an Ad Hoc Committee document and bears the general title of "Statements made in the Conference on Disarmament during the first part of its 1993 session on agenda item 8: Transparency in armaments."

The Group regrets that its statements have been omitted from the above-mentioned compilation and deplores that the request for their inclusion, which was in keeping with standard practice of the Ad Hoc Committee and the CD, has been formally opposed in the Ad Hoc Committee.

The G.21 finds opposition to its request unprecedented and unacceptable. Ad hoc committees are the instances where most of the delegations' positions are stated and, therefore, even though no formal PVs are kept, tapes and other records of the work exist; they are the sources from which stated positions can be drawn.

It is regrettable that delegations be required to repeat their statements in formal CD plenary before they are duly reflected in CD documents and reports. In the Group's view, this development undermines Ad Hoc Committee standard practice and can entail needless complications for all in the future.

(Mrs. Bauta Solés, Cuba)

The G.21 formally requests that the present statement be circulated as a CD official document and, at the same time, asks for the inclusion of its statements of 22 and 25 March 1993, quoted above, in a revised version of CD/TIA/INF.2, i.e. Revision 1.

The G.21 regrets the time consumed in resolving this problem in the CD plenary, which would have been avoided had the standard practice been duly observed.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Cuba for her statement and for the kind words she addressed to the Chair. That concludes my list of speakers for today. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor at this stage? I give the floor to the distinguished representative of Mexico.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): First of all I should like to place on record the appreciation of the delegation of Mexico for the way in which your delegation has been discharging the tasks of President of the Conference for these past four weeks.

When the history of multilateral efforts for the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is written, we will have to examine dozens and dozens of files in order to facilitate this examination of what we hope will be the final phase of these efforts by the international community, and in view of its indisputable interest for the members of the Conference on Disarmament, the delegation of Mexico has requested the secretariat to distribute as an official document of the Conference the text of a letter dated 14 June 1993 which the forty-third Pugwash Conference sent to the President of the United States on the question of nuclear testing. As you know, the Pugwash Conference was held recently in Sweden.

My delegation would also like to suggest that the Conference on Disarmament should continue the consideration in an informal meeting, and in the presence of the observers, of the draft declaration contained in document CD/1200/Rev.1 of 11 June. As you know, this text was revised in the light of the discussions that we held in the Conference in an informal meeting on 9 June.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement and for the kind words he addressed to the Chair. The document mentioned by him has been received and will be circulated.

It has been proposed by the Mexican representative that the CD should hold an informal meeting to discuss document CD/1200/Rev.1 submitted by the Group of 21. Under rule 19 of the rules of procedure of the CD, the holding of such an informal meeting requires a consensus on the part of the CD. Does anyone wish to express an opinion on the holding of such an informal meeting? Please allow me to add that the Group of 21 has expressed the view that the informal meeting should be held after the conclusion of today's plenary. I now give the floor to the representative of the United Kingdom.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Mr. President, let me begin by congratulating you on your assumption of the presidency. My delegation would wish to consider this proposal before agreeing to it and, therefore, we would see some difficulty about having the meeting immediately after this plenary.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): Obviously we understand that delegations might require more time to consider documents and proposals, but I would like to point out that it has been more than a week now since the original text was submitted, and the revised version has been available since 11 June, in other words for six days now. So with all due respect, my delegation thinks that there has been sufficient time for examining the text which, as I said, was revised in the light of our discussions here on 9 June.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I am afraid I am somewhat confused. At the Presidential consultations yesterday, which unfortunately I was not able to attend myself, I understand that the representative of the G.21 said that the Group had not at that stage decided on what they wished the Conference to do with this statement; whether it was indeed intended to be a statement by the G.21 or a draft of a statement to be made by the Conference. As I understand it, this was to be considered further by the G.21, so this strengthens my view that we do need time to consider this matter.

Mr. FELICIO (Brazil): Mr. President, I am glad to see you chairing this meeting and I would like to convey to your delegation the thanks of the delegation of Brazil for the efficient manner in which you are conducting our work.

I take the floor in the first place to support the proposal by the Ambassador of Mexico that we continue consideration in informal plenaries of the proposal made by the G.21 of a draft decision by this Conference calling upon ourselves to negotiate in an expeditious manner a nuclear-test-ban treaty. This was the sense of the proposal as far as I can recall.

I also take the floor to thank you for having proposed to us that non-member delegates participate in the informal plenary. I think this is a wise proposal and in this way you are asking us in a collective manner to decide upon an important question. I congratulate you on this also.

Finally, I would like to reiterate the expectation of my Government that the Conference on Disarmament decides expeditiously to take this decision which is reiterated by many countries in this forum, in the United Nations and elsewhere, that we should negotiate as fast as possible a nuclear-test-ban treaty.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I'm afraid my bewilderment increases. This is now being described as a draft decision. The paper before us talks of a draft statement. I think this confirms the report I was given of the discussion yesterday, when no one seems to be clear what it is that is proposed. Until there is a clear explanation of what is proposed, we cannot get instructions on it. As things stand, as I made clear a week ago when we last had these discussions, my delegation would not be able to go along with a decision or a statement containing these sentiments.

Mr. QUIROS (Peru) (translated from Spanish): My delegation, too, wishes to express its appreciation for the very able way in which the Ambassador of China and the delegation of China have been guiding the work over the past four weeks. I have taken the floor because yesterday my delegation participated in the Presidential consultations on the sixth floor, in its capacity as the delegation that will be coordinating the work of the Group of 21 as from next Monday. Unfortunately, no doubt for important reasons, our coordinator until this Friday, the Ambassador of Zaire, is not in the room, but I would like to say that in the consultations yesterday the delegation of the United Kingdom raised the question of whether document CD/1200/Rev.1 referred to a draft statement that would be made by the Group of 21 on its own behalf, or whether this was a proposal of the Group of 21 for a Conference on Disarmament statement. The Ambassador of Zaire yesterday - regrettably there was no simultaneous interpretation - spoke in French and made it clear - and since he is not here I will take the opportunity to do so - that this was a proposal by the Group of 21 for a statement by this body, the Conference on Disarmament. So my colleague from Brazil, no doubt through a slip of the tongue, referred to a draft decision. In short, it is a draft statement being proposed by the Group of 21 in order that, if there is consensus, it will be made by the Conference on Disarmament, and I would be grateful if the Ambassador of the United Kingdom could pass on this message to his Group, could discuss it and then as soon as possible we might be able to have an informal plenary to discuss it.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Peru for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. From the discussion we have just had, at present it appears we have no consensus on this issue. I will continue to hold consultations on the matter, and also invite the incoming President to participate in the relevant consultations. I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): As far as I know, in order to hold an informal meeting on a given subject, it is not necessary for there to be consensus on that subject. This is why they are informal. What we are asking for, and we repeat this now, is an informal meeting to discuss the content of the text of the statement that is to be found in CD/1200/Rev.1, and we have asked for this meeting to be held now, after this plenary meeting, and in the presence of the observers. I wonder whether there is any objection to this proposal.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Mexico for his statement. The distinguished representative of Mexico raises the issue of whether the holding of an informal meeting today to discuss document CD/1200/Rev.1 can be the subject of consensus, and I would like to hear views from delegations. I now give the floor to the representative of Cuba.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): Those familiar with the Conference on Disarmament know that very often we are bound by precedent. On 25 March last, in this room, a proposal was put before the Conference, and some delegations asked for the proposal to be considered in informal consultations. The same view, but as a contrary request, that is, that the proposal in question needed further thought and therefore it was not possible at this time at least to hold an informal meeting, was expressed by other delegations, including my own, leading to a situation which clearly demonstrated that there was no consensus in the room for the holding of informal consultations. Now we are in the same situation. Despite that, the informal consultations were in fact held on the 25th. Now we are in the same situation, but in reverse, in a certain sense. We might say that there is a group of delegations, those that suggested last time that there was no consensus on the substance to allow the informal consultations, which are now asking for informal consultations, and those who at that time insisted that despite the fact that there was no consensus we should have informal consultations, are now saying that there is no consensus in order, in this case, to follow a similar path. Anyway, what my delegation wishes to say is that there is a precedent, and if we are going to follow the precedents, it is not essential for this forum, at this moment, and if we are to follow the precedent set on 25 March last, this forum would not require consensus in this room just as it did not require a consensus on 25 March last in order to adopt the solution of informal consultations. Everything I have said here is to be found in the proceedings and records of this Conference, so that I do not understand how we can act in an ambivalent manner with regard to this procedure at this moment. What is involved in any event, something I think that will redound to the benefit of the Conference, is to sit down to discuss a proposal and try to see whether there is an area of common ground on which we can all achieve a compromise which will satisfy us. Obviously, if we do not hold the discussion we are not going to achieve any final result, which, ultimately, in view of the flexibility shown, even extending to changes in the original text, might benefit us and satisfy us all. Therefore my delegation would also be inclined to favour respecting the precedent set on 25 March last, in which, despite the express opposition of delegations here that asked for more time to analyse the substantive proposal that had been put before us, we held actual informal consultations in this case. I have ventured to refer to this precedent because my delegation is concerned at the disorganized way in which we seem to be tending to proceed in this room.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): I should be clear. I am not objecting to holding an informal meeting at some stage on this, though we have already had one, or indeed effectively two, informal meetings on the subject from which it became clear, and the President drew the conclusion, that there was no consensus, and I am

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

afraid that remains the case, but there is certainly no possibility of there being consensus if we are not given time to consider the new document, and for me at any rate it is new - I only saw it for the first time this morning; I'm surprised that it has been around for six days. My problem is compounded by the fact that according to the record which I have been given of yesterday's Presidential consultations, the President concluded that the matter would be discussed further once the G.21 had decided what they wanted to do with the paper and after Groups had been informed, and it was on that basis that I did not attempt to get any instructions before this meeting, and I think it is only reasonable that we should be given a chance, if there are important changes - I don't immediately see them, and my guess is that I am going to continue to have difficulty with this text - but if I am to try to get instructions on it, then we need time and I don't think I will be the only delegation in that position.

Mr. HOFFMAN (Germany): First of all, let me congratulate the Chinese delegation on the able way they have led us in our deliberations.

I am really curious as to where this document has been these last six days. I saw it only yesterday afternoon and I made it available immediately to the capital, but I am in the same position as my United Kingdom colleague. I have no instructions on this. I am not opposed to holding an informal meeting where I can listen but not participate; I have no problem with this. My problem is one of the basic question as to whether we need consensus for an informal meeting or not. I don't think that we had a precedent on 25 March where we changed our rules of procedure. In our rules it says clearly in rule 19 that arrangements such as informal meetings can be agreed by the Conference, and agreement, of course, is under rule 18 by consensus. I don't think we have changed this on 25 March I'm afraid, so if there is no consensus in this room on holding an informal meeting, I'm afraid we will not have one - this is my reading.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Germany for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. From the discussion it appears that no one objects to the holding of an informal meeting, but there are different ideas as to when the meeting should be held. If it is agreeable to all, the President will consult with the incoming President concerning when an informal meeting shall be held to discuss document CD/1200/Rev.1, and hopes that we can reach an agreement. I now give the floor to the representative of Kenya.

Mr. KOIKAI (Kenya): Mr. President, my delegation would also like to join all those other delegations that have warmly congratulated your delegation on the very able manner in which you have been conducting the work of this Conference during your presidency.

We have been discussing a very important issue, and the question of timing on the discussion of this paper has been at issue during this morning's discussion and my delegation, being a member of the Group of 21, would have desired that we hold an informal meeting this morning, but as it has been revealed from the discussion, this will not be possible. I would therefore

(Mr. Koikai, Kenya)

like to propose, Mr. President - in spite of the fact that you have stated you and the incoming President will hold consultations on the most appropriate time to have a discussion on this paper - I would like to propose that such an informal meeting could be held after the next plenary meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 22 June. I am sure that all delegations that have not had instructions from their capitals might receive such instructions, and we could deal with this matter expeditiously on Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Kenya for his statement and for his kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Spain.

Mr. PEREZ-VILLANUEVA (Spain) (translated from Spanish): My congratulations to you and your delegation on taking up the presidency of the Conference, and my offer of unlimited cooperation to the extent that I can be of help. Two points very briefly. I would like to thank you and the delegations of Mexico and Brazil expressly and formally for the wish you have expressed to set up an arrangement for addressing this matter that is before us at the moment, an arrangement which would allow my delegation to attend a discussion which is of great interest to it. And in the second place, the second point is that I hope that whatever decision is taken regarding the time and format of the meeting, whatever decision is taken by the Conference in this plenary for dealing with this topic, I hope that it will enable my delegation to attend.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Spain for his statement. The distinguished delegate has made a concrete suggestion - that after the next plenary, that is to say after next Tuesday's plenary, an informal plenary should be held to discuss document CD/1200/Rev.1. The President would like to hear suggestions from delegates. There are no other suggestions.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): Another related issue is that of the participation of non-members in the informal meeting to be held next Tuesday. From the discussions it appears that there is no opposition to their participation. So may I take it that we have decided on the matter?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I now give the floor to the Secretary-General to make a statement.

Mr. BERASATEGUI (Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations) (translated from Spanish): Since several delegations have taken the floor today in Spanish, I will follow their example, since it is of course one of the official languages of the Conference. I have briefly asked for the floor to clarify a point which is raised in the statement read out today by the representative of Cuba on half of the Group of 21. In that statement

(Mr. Berasategui, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Persona. Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

reference is made to the fact that that Group regrets that the statements referred to have been left out of the compilation prepared by the secretariat. I would like to refer to this last matter in order to dispel any misunderstanding that may arise in this regard.

As I have explained in the past to the distinguished representative of Cuba, I think it was last week, the long-standing practice of the secretariat has been not to include in compilations statements that are made in informal meetings without the agreement of the body concerned, whatever the body may be, and this practice that has been followed, as I say, for a long time now has a very simple explanation to it. It is in fact the only way of reflecting accurately in a compilation the official statements of delegations which are to be found in the records of the Conference, or, alternatively, those statements which the members of the Conference designate as such as a result of agreement in the body concerned.

I must say in this regard that the tapes of the meetings of subsidiary bodies are not of guaranteed accuracy. In the first place, they are taken only from the English interpretation booth, because of the economic constraints that have been in effect in the secretariat since 1986, and although I am of course the first to say that the Conference has the best interpreters not only in the Palais des Nations but I think in the whole of Europe, it is a fact that there may be differences of emphasis in the interpretation of certain statements, which consequently might not be properly rendered. A second reason is that, if statements made in informal meetings are to be reflected, what then will happen with statements made in very informal consultation meetings that are held among delegations, for which we in the secretariat have no record?

The third problem we have faced in the secretariat is that the equipment may not be completely reliable, and we have had various cases of gaps in the tape recordings of meetings of the Conference, and this occurred not long ago on one occasion in connection with a plenary meeting. Of course these tape recordings help the secretariat in preparing certain draft reports. We did so for items 2 and 3 in the past, and also for the reports of the subsidiary bodies. But the difference is that these reports are subject to the formal approval - I must emphasize this point - the formal approval of the members of the Conference. This is not the case for a simple compilation. In addition, the statements in the draft reports submitted to the subsidiary bodies are not verbatim statements, as is the case for a compilation.

I would like to say that there is no record in the Conference of a compilation containing informal statements, unless the body concerned stipulates that it has no objection to including them. I would like to refer to one case, one of the most recent compilations that the secretariat has prepared at the request of the Conference. In April 1990 the secretariat circulated a compilation of proposals concerning the improved and effective functioning of the Conference. In that compilation the secretariat added only

(Mr. Berasategui, Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and Personal Representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations)

those statements that were to be found in official documents. At a later meeting on the subject, the Conference agreed expressly to include the informal statements in the compilation, and accordingly the secretariat produced a Revision 1 that was subsequently considered by a further meeting of the Conference. Obviously, had there been agreement in the subsidiary body on the inclusion of the statements to which reference was made by the distinguished representative of Cuba, the secretariat would have done that straight away.

In pursuance of the statement that the Group has just made, the secretariat is now going to produce a new document which will contain the statements that have been referred to by the distinguished representative of Cuba. In doing so, however, I would like to clarify one point. I must say that although this point is not covered in the statement by the Group of 21, a series of statements have been made in plenary on this very subject since 25 March, which was the deadline for the compilation. But very recently we have also had two heads of State, one of them belonging to a member country of the Group of 21, and a Minister for Foreign Affairs, who have referred to this subject, and it would be logical for these statements to be included in the new document. I hope that this suggestion will be acceptable.

To conclude, I would also like to say that the secretariat is going to circulate again the list of measures relating to documentation that is to be found in a statement made by my predecessor on 10 April 1986, which was adopted by the Conference in an informal meeting on 22 April of the same year. You will remember that this document containing the list of measures is drawn to the attention of the delegations each year. My predecessor did so from 1987 onwards, and I did the same this year.

Mrs. BAUTA SOLES (Cuba) (translated from Spanish): First of all, I would like to thank the Secretary-General for the clarification he has just provided to the Conference and at the same time I would like to make a few clarifications of my own. It is true that I had occasion to talk to the Secretary-General about the matter in question, not in my capacity as representative of Cuba but in my capacity as Coordinator of the Group of 21 for transparency in armaments. It is true that my country's position appears in the compilation that the secretariat was kind enough to prepare, and has done so from the outset. The second point I wish to mention is that while I appreciate the clarity of the observations made by the Secretary-General, I also wish to place on record that it was not exactly opposition on the part of the secretariat which led to the non-inclusion of the Group of 21's statements in the compilation prepared in the Ad Hoc Committee. However, we accept as sound the clarifications which the Secretary-General deemed relevant to provide. Since I had occasion to talk to our distinguished Secretary-General about this matter, I have also had the responsibility of explaining in detail to the Group of 21 the points he made to me concerning the documentation situation. Despite this, the Group on the basis of its knowledge of and experience in the Conference on Disarmament, decided to draft the statement

(Mr. Bauta Solés, Cuba)

that I read out. Lastly, I think there is a need to take into account the proposal made by the secretariat, whereby the Revision 2 proposed by the Group of 21 would include subsequent statements on the transparency issue made by other speakers, and you may be sure, Mr. President, that this suggestion, which I am sure will be duly endorsed by certain member delegations of the Conference, will be considered by the Group of 21 with a view to taking a decision.

Mr. GROSSI (Argentina) (translated from Spanish): This morning is certainly one for procedural discussions, and as a result my delegation has also decided to join the various interventions which we have had on procedural issues. We listened with great interest to the clarification provided by the Secretary-General on the matter at issue, raised by the Group of 21's statement on the question of the compilation relating to item 8 on our agenda, Transparency in armaments, and the Secretary-General was kind enough to mention that in the intervening period that falls in between the interval encompassing that compilation and today, several statements have been made, including some by heads of State and naturally including the statement made by the President of my country, who referred in a part of his address before this body to the question of transparency in armaments. Of course, my delegation believes that the suggestion made by the Secretary-General is pertinent, useful, and also recalls that the position of the Argentine Republic was also expressed at the level of the head of my delegation in the first part of this session in the compilation, so that I consider this suggestion to be a useful and constructive suggestion. I would just like to say that the title of the compilation will therefore have to be changed, because the original title referred to statements made in the first part of the session, and the Group of 21 referred to that. Now I think we will have a broader document and one that will also embrace the second part.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I thank the representative of Argentina for his statement.

May I now turn to another subject? I am pleased to report to you that the consultations held for some time now on the dates for the third part of the annual session have led to an agreement which I reported at the Presidential consultations which took place yesterday. As this is a matter subject to a decision by the Conference, I shall now report to you, for decision, the following arrangement. First of all, the opening date will be moved from Monday, 19 July to Monday, 26 July. Second, the closing date will be Friday, 3 September instead of Thursday, 2 September. Third, the presidency of Cuba, which was to conclude originally on Sunday, 8 August, will now end on Tuesday, 10 August, and that of Egypt will begin the following day. By this arrangement the presidency of Cuba will regain the plenary meeting lost by the postponement of the opening date, by chairing the plenary meeting scheduled for Tuesday, 10 August. There will be two additional working days for the Cuban presidency, which will partly compensate for the five working days lost at the beginning of the third part of the session. For its part, Egypt will regain the plenary meeting lost on Tuesday, 10 August by the addition of a plenary meeting which will be the last of the annual session, on 3 September. It will also regain one of the two working days which will now

(The President)

be part of the Cuban presidency. This arrangement is acceptable to the two delegations providing the presidency during the third part of the annual session. I hope that it is also acceptable to all of you. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Conference agrees to the proposal that I am now making.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I shall now turn to the informal paper circulated by the secretariat, containing the timetable of meetings to be held next week by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies. As usual, the timetable is merely indicative and may be changed if necessary. On that understanding I suggest we adopt this timetable.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Chinese): I should now like to make a statement as the presidency of China approaches its end.

As you know, the presidency of China concludes this week. At this juncture, I would like to express my delegation's appreciation to all the delegations participating in the work of the Conference for their assistance and cooperation during the Chinese presidency. During the past four weeks the President of the Argentine Republic, His Excellency Carlos Menem, the President of Romania, His Excellency Ion Iliescu, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Norway, His Excellency Johann Jørgen Holst, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, His Excellency Pieter Kooijmans, came to address this Conference. In addition, the Vice-Premier and Foreign Minister of China, Mr. Qian Qichen, also sent a message to this Conference. All this not only provides us with inspiration and encouragement but also manifests the great importance and expectation the international community places on this Conference.

Please allow me to take this opportunity to ask the representative of Cuba to convey to Ambassador José Pérez Novoa, the incoming President of the Conference, our best wishes for success in his new responsibilities, which I am sure he will discharge in an exceptional manner because of his well-known experience and diplomatic competence.

I would also like to express our gratitude to Ambassador Vicente Berasategui, the Secretary-General of the Conference and Personal Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General, and his very able staff, including the interpreters and translators, for their diligence and invaluable assistance.

That concludes our work for today, and I shall now adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Tuesday, 22 June at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 11.30 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.654/Corr.1
12 November 1993

ENGLISH
ARABIC and ENGLISH only

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOURTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 17 June 1993, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China)

Corrigendum

Page 4, 4th paragraph

Intervention by Mrs. Bauta Solés (Cuba) for Ambassador Leon
please read Ambassador Hou.



CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.655
22 June 1993

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIFTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Tuesday, 22 June 1993, at 10 a.m.

President: Mrs. Magda Bauta Solés (Cuba)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I have pleasure in declaring open the 655th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As it takes up the functions of President of the Conference, the delegation of Cuba wishes to inform delegations that, since Ambassador José Pérez Novoa is out of town on an official mission, I will have the honour of replacing him today in keeping with the provisions of rule 10 of the Conference's rules of procedure. It will therefore be for Ambassador Pérez Novoa to make the opening statement for this term as President, to which my country attaches special importance. However, I would like to assure you as of now of his wish to work closely with all delegations. Likewise I wish to express our gratitude to the distinguished representative of China, Ambassador Hou Zhitong, for his outstanding work as President, in which he once again demonstrated his diplomatic experience, intelligence and knowledge of disarmament issues. I have pleasure in extending a warm welcome among us to the new representative of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Grigori Berdennikov, who is participating for the first time in our work. Ambassador Berdennikov is well known in disarmament circles as he has previously participated in the work of the Conference and in other bodies associated with the subjects with which we deal. Ambassador Berdennikov can of course count on the cooperation of my delegation in carrying out his important functions.

I have no speakers on my list for today. As you will probably remember among the measures for the improved and effective functioning of the Conference it was decided last year that, if there were no speakers, it would be possible to cancel the Tuesday plenary meetings. However, we agreed with the secretariat to keep the plenary meeting scheduled for today since the Conference had anyway to hold an informal meeting to consider document CD/1200/Rev.1, which contains a draft statement by the Group of 21 on the total suspension of nuclear tests. If any delegation considers it appropriate to make a statement at the last minute, it will have the possibility of doing so now. Does any delegation wish to take the floor? Since none does, I shall suspend this plenary meeting as several delegations this morning have asked me for it to be resumed after our informal consultations. I will therefore convene immediately the informal meeting scheduled for today. It is understood that, as was stated by the President during the plenary meeting last Thursday, delegations of non-member States that participate in the work of the Conference may, if they so wish, participate in the informal meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 10.15 a.m. and resumed at 10.40 a.m.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): We will now resume the 655th plenary meeting. Would any delegation like to take the floor? I give the floor to the distinguished delegation of Mexico.

Mrs. CARVALHO de PLASA (Mexico) (translated from Spanish):
Madam President, as this is the first formal meeting in which my delegation has taken the floor under the Cuban presidency, allow me to extend my Government's sincerest congratulations on your new duties, which we are sure you will discharge successfully. You have our confidence, appreciation and cooperation.

(Mrs. Carvalho de Plasa, Mexico)

The Government of Mexico is convinced that the Conference on Disarmament made an excellent start to its work in January. We believe that this points to a potential for progress, a new spirit, new prospects and a brighter future for this forum, and therefore we are now wondering what has happened to the draft statement on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Everyone here is sure to wonder whether there is an echo in the Council chamber, because they will imagine that they have already heard these words here before.

We are disappointed but not surprised that we have not managed to adopt what we thought was a simple decision to support a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. A little over three weeks ago, on 3 June, we proposed that the Conference on Disarmament, in its capacity as a corporate body and an autonomous organ of the United Nations, should adopt measures to ensure the success of the negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Certainly, quite a number of consecutive United Nations resolutions have been adopted on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, in 1992 with just one vote against. However, our proposal suggested that the Conference should find some way of supplementing what had already been done in the United Nations. In addition, the complete prohibition of nuclear testing is an item on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. It is the first item that the Conference on Disarmament has included on its agenda since its establishment in almost 14 years of existence. We regret that two or three delegations have decided to thwart this modest proposal by resorting to the technique of the pocket veto. What is most disturbing though, is that there are apparent signs that some of the countries represented here really object to a comprehensive nuclear test ban and are obviously frightened of it.

The future of the Conference on Disarmament is in our hands. This body can become more active and gain more interest or wither away. If we seek the former for the future, then we will undoubtedly have to be more action-oriented. The draft statement proposed by the Group of 21 is an example of something action-oriented. This draft statement would not have been binding for anyone. It just set forth what was known to all and encouraged participation by the members of the Conference on Disarmament and the non-member participants in the Conference. After all, a comprehensive nuclear test ban will be successful if it enjoys broad participation.

The Conference on Disarmament is about to end its second session and we have lost an opportunity. We regret that a forum whose members often complain about the lack of progress has not been able to come out clearly in support of action on an issue that is of concern to us all and incumbent on us all.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Mexico for her kind words and have pleasure in giving the floor on this occasion to the distinguished Ambassador Errera of the delegation of France.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (translated from French): Since we are in formal session, I formally reiterate the congratulations I extended to you a while ago for success in your presidency. I do not wish to enter into a controversy, though this room might derive some benefit from one from time to time. I would simply like to say two things having listened very carefully to

(Mr. Errera, France)

what has just been said by the distinguished representative of Mexico. These two things are the following. First, I note that the delegation of Mexico had little confidence, few illusions as to the outcome of the debates, since it had already prepared a purple passage challenging and criticizing the result obtained. The second point is more bothersome. It is no secret that we are rather keen defenders of the Conference on Disarmament and the central role - that is the word I think I used last week - the central role which the Conference on Disarmament should play in any negotiations, if there are negotiations, and if we take part in them, on a nuclear-test-ban treaty. Consequently I regret the type of criticism which has been levelled at the Western nuclear Powers, since that is how they were implicitly designated, and the "pocket veto" they apparently have. I will not dwell on this matter because a lot could be said about past cases. I will merely say the following. If the Conference on Disarmament is to play a real, effective, central role today in negotiating a nuclear-test-ban treaty, then we must stop using the technique which was current for many years during which the Conference on Disarmament made no progress in any field whatsoever, a technique whereby responsibility was attributed to a certain number of countries. Doing this today will discourage a number of governments from using the Conference on Disarmament to pursue the objective which is close to the heart of so many delegations, that of a test-ban treaty. I am not seeking to create controversy when I say this; I say this seriously because we are at a point, and in a short time we will perhaps be at a point, where important decisions will have to be taken, and these decisions should not be jeopardized by impressions which those who resort to these practices would certainly not wish them to produce.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Errera for his words and I reiterate my appreciation for his greetings to my delegation. I now wish to call on the distinguished Ambassador of the United Kingdom.

Sir Michael WESTON (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland): Madam President, thank you very much and now since we are in a formal meeting, let me offer you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency and assure you of our full cooperation.

I haven't really very much to add to what I said in our informal meeting just now and in our formal meeting last week. However, I would like to echo the remarks of the distinguished representative of France. Quite apart from the substance of this matter, my delegation does, as I have said, sincerely doubt the utility of a statement of this kind. It seems to us to contrast very vividly with the serious and constructive and useful work which we have been doing this year in the Ad Hoc Committee on NTB under Ambassador Tanaka's wise guidance. In the view of my delegation that is the best way to make progress to the eventual aim of a CTBT, an aim which we all share.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Thank you for your comments and the words addressed to my delegation. I now call on the distinguished delegation of Brazil.

Mr. FELICIO (Brazil): Let me formally welcome the delegation of Cuba to the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament.

With regard to this proposal made by the Group of 21 of a draft statement contained in document CD/1200/Rev.1 dated 11 June 1993, my delegation would like to state that this proposal is perfectly in line with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly and approved there by the vast majority of States parties. That is why my delegation saw no harm and no offence in such a draft proposal that simply urges the States members of the Conference on Disarmament to contribute to the early attainment of a multilateral legal regime on a comprehensive nuclear test ban and reaffirms the responsibilities of this Conference in the negotiation of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Many thanks to the delegation of Brazil for its words to my delegation and also its comments. I now call on the distinguished delegation of Mexico.

Mrs CARVALHO de PLASA (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): It is certainly not the intention of my delegation to argue in this plenary meeting with any delegation, but I think it might be useful if I were to make the two clarifications. First of all, my delegation did not just prepare one statement, my delegation prepared three statements - one for the informal meeting to introduce the document, another to express pleasure at the adoption of the statement, because my delegation ardently hoped that this would be the case, and another in case it was not adopted. As my delegation cannot improvise in such cases and prefers to be very careful, that is why my delegation had this in writing. Secondly, the term "pocket veto" can certainly not be attributed to the delegation of Mexico. As the distinguished representative of France knows well, this term has been used here and, in the same context by another delegation.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the distinguished representative of Mexico. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? As none does, and before concluding the 655th meeting of this Conference, perhaps the delegates present here will allow me to make an announcement that has to do with the fact that there will be a meeting of the Contact Group of the Group of 21 on the prevention of an arms race in outer space in room VIII on the third floor at the same time as originally scheduled.

The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on 24 June at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.656

24 June 1993

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 24 June 1993, at 10 a.m.

President: Mrs. Magda Bauta Solés (Cuba)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I have pleasure in declaring open the 656th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

As delegations are aware, two distinguished representatives are leaving us to take up new and important functions that they have been given by their Governments. Both have recently discharged the duties of President of the Conference with great competence, tact and intelligence at particularly delicate periods of our work. Ambassador Michel Servais of Belgium guided the work of the Conference during the conclusion of the negotiations on the Convention banning chemical weapons. Subsequently, he was entrusted with the delicate task of initiating open-ended consultations on questions concerning the membership and agenda of the Conference, a task that he carried out with the efficiency and dedication we have come to expect of him. Ambassador Celso Amorim of Brazil, who for reasons that are connected with his new post cannot be with us today, is concluding a particularly successful period as representative of his country in our midst. He also had the difficult task of helping Ambassador Servais in the consultations I have already referred to, and in particular the delicate responsibility of conducting our work in a very important phase as regards the organization of the Conference, after the conclusion of the Convention on chemical weapons. His efforts, conducted with his well-known diplomatic skill and outstanding personal qualities, were crowned with success. Ambassador Amorim has just taken up a post that does justice to his professional qualities, that of Secretary-General in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of his country. Other esteemed colleagues from his delegation are also leaving Geneva together with Ambassador Celso Amorim. On behalf of the Conference and on my own behalf I would like to wish all these representatives and their spouses every success in their future activities.

On the list of speakers for today I have the representatives of Brazil and Peru. I now call on the representative of Brazil, Minister de Sá Barbuda.

Mr. BARBUDA (Brazil): Madam President, it is my pleasure to take the floor during the Cuban presidency. Let me convey to you our warm congratulations for your assumption of this important function of President of the Conference on Disarmament. It is gratifying to see the Conference presided by a representative of Cuba, a country with which Brazil has friendly and close relations.

The purpose of my taking the floor today is to convey to you and to all distinguished representatives of members and observer delegations the farewell message received from the head of the Brazilian delegation, Ambassador Celso Amorim. It was Ambassador Amorim's intention to be in Geneva today and address the Conference on Disarmament, but important duties kept him in Brazil for some more days. I will read his message now.

"I have recently been assigned with new challenging duties by the Minister of External Relations of Brazil and I should shortly be leaving Geneva.

(Mr. Barbuda, Brazil)

"Since I cannot attend this last plenary meeting of the second part of the 1993 session, I have instructed the members of my delegation to place on the records of the Conference on Disarmament that it was for me highly gratifying, both personal and professionally, to represent my country in this Conference.

"Almost two years ago, as a newcomer to the Conference, I was received with all the courtesy and friendship one could expect. Help and encouragement were frequently offered from the colleagues, who soon became my source of intellectual inspiration. I am grateful to you all.

"During my stay in Geneva I shared with you the satisfaction to see the historic conclusion by the Conference of the long-awaited chemical weapons Convention. I was honoured with the appointment to sign it in Paris, last January, on behalf of the Brazilian Government.

"Alphabetical determinism, as I said before, made the responsibility of presiding over this Conference fall upon me in the very beginning of this year.

"Niccolò Machiavelli believed that fate, la fortuna, could be influenced by personal skills, la virtù, to anticipate and prepare the ground for events to come. I think Machiavelli would be disappointed to see my exercise of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament with more fortuna than virtù.

"It was a fortunate coincidence for me to become the President of this august body during my rather short stay in Geneva. I consider no less than a privilege to have had such an opportunity, which has been occurring at long six-year intervals only.

"I was also fortunate to have presided the Conference when the United Nations disarmament machinery was being reassessed. The Conference on Disarmament then gave proof of its vitality with the prompt establishment of four ad hoc committees and the early start of its substantive work in the 1993 session. Two Friends of the President, Ambassadors Marín Bosch, of Mexico, and O'Sullivan, of Australia, were nominated before I concluded my period as President to conduct consultations on the issues of the agenda and of the membership of the Conference. I wish them a successful conclusion of the important tasks entrusted to them.

"Our common effort also resulted in the elaboration of two reports later forwarded to the reconvened session of the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly: one of those contained the comments of the Conference regarding the report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations entitled 'New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era'; and the other report referred to the ongoing review of the agenda, composition and methods of work of the Conference.

(Mr. Barbuda, Brazil)

"With these reports, we met a challenge which seemed very difficult if not impossible. I am grateful to the support offered to me as President of the Conference in the production of those results. They were only possible because of the very high level of the participating delegates, who expressed their national interests together with a clear interpretation of the wish of the international community.

"We have witnessed rapid changes in the world in recent years together with the opening of an unprecedented window of opportunity for this Conference to reaffirm its efficiency as a negotiating body. Results are expected from the Conference now in nuclear disarmament, in particular the prohibition of nuclear tests, in conventional weapons control, and in ensuring that advanced technologies, such as those used in outer space, are not diverted to non-peaceful purposes.

"In relation to the so-called sensitive technologies, I would like to see an enhanced role of our negotiating body. Multilateral rules for high-technology transfers and control are a natural consequence of disarmament negotiations. I am convinced that multilaterally agreed rules in this field are likely to be implemented and respected without undue excessive restrictions that tend to interfere with economic development.

"We should keep in mind in our endeavours that measures to ensure international security go far beyond simple arms regulation and disarmament. Security and the protection of peoples' welfare are inseparable, when the wish is the promotion of long-lasting peace.

"Continued connivance, in a positive sense, is required from the representatives in the Conference on Disarmament in their efforts to promote international security. Let us connive and produce the expected results in disarmament, support the promotion of social justice, democracy and well-being and so be proud of our contribution to the construction of a more secure and peaceful world.

"In the exercise of my new functions, I will continue to follow closely the work of this Conference and I already pledge the full commitment of Brazil in contributing to the attainment of the objectives of our multilateral negotiation. The Conference on Disarmament will certainly continue to count on the support of the delegation of Brazil.

"My final words are of gratitude for all representatives and for the Secretary-General of the Conference and his competent staff."

Here ends the message. I just wish to thank you again for the very kind words that you addressed to Ambassador Amorim and to the delegation of Brazil.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Brazil for his statement with the message sent to us by Ambassador Amorim, as well as the kind words addressed to the Chair. I would be grateful to him if he would convey our words of farewell to Ambassador Amorim. I now give the floor to the representative of Peru, Mr. Quirós.

Mr. QUIROS (Peru) (translated from Spanish): First of all allow me to say how pleased my delegation is at seeing a brother country from Latin America, Cuba, and you, Madam President, whose outstanding professional and personal qualities are well known to all of us, take up the presidency of our Conference. You may count on the full cooperation of the delegation of Peru. I have asked for the floor this morning on behalf of the Group of 21 to make a very brief statement concerning the non-formation of ad hoc committees and the non-appointment of special coordinators for items 2, 3, 6 and 7 on our agenda.

(continued in English)

On behalf of the Group of 21, I would like to make the following statement. The Conference on Disarmament, in document CD/1180 dated 22 January 1993, agreed "without prejudice to any future decisions on the organizational framework of other items" to begin its work immediately on four agenda items. The Group of 21 had gone along with the above based on the understanding as was reflected in its statement of 21 January 1993 at the plenary of the Conference on Disarmament (CD/PV.637). The Group of 21 notes that the Conference on Disarmament has not been able to establish ad hoc committees and regrets that it has not appointed special coordinators for agenda items 2, 3, 6 and 7. This situation should in no way constitute a precedent for the future work of the Conference. This is also without prejudice to paragraph 5 (d) of the decision on the improved and effective functioning of the Conference on Disarmament contained in document CD/1036 of 21 August 1990.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Peru for his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. Does any other delegation wish to take the floor? I have pleasure in calling on the distinguished Ambassador Michel Servais of Belgium.

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (translated from French): I congratulate you, Madam President, and thank you for giving me the floor. I congratulate you because it is your country which is serving as President at the end of this second session and which will be in the Chair until the beginning of the next session, well into the middle of the next session. This is a delicate role because you are going to have to give the push which will allow us to start working on the annual report of the Conference, and that is hard work, God knows - I speak from experience.

My usual neighbour Ambassador Celso Amorim, ever modest, has given us the surprise of not coming today to hear all the nice things you thought of him, and of me. My colleague from Brazil has said all there was to say on the political issues, and on the message we have to leave for others, so I won't repeat the wise words that we heard just now. You too, Madam President, said more or less everything that could have been said, and I am still quite overcome at the high opinion you have of me. I know my colleagues think nothing of it, but I will take it at face value. What is important is to thank you wholeheartedly. I wish to thank all those here, all those who have

(Mr. Servais, Belgium)

already left us for other posts, or who will be leaving us. You first of all, Madam, for the functions you are discharging, all my colleagues, because throughout the short time I have spent in Geneva I have benefited from their cooperation and kindness. It is quite typical that in the Conference on Disarmament we are known by our first names and nobody around the room feels obliged to engage in role-playing. Naturally I thank the Secretary-General, Ambassador Berasategui, but in a very special way. We have travelled a long way together - six months now - and when I refer to the Secretary-General, obviously this is a shorthand, because this of course covers all his devoted colleagues who I am seeing for the last time in this room, at least in my capacity as Belgian Ambassador to the Conference on Disarmament. I thank them because, especially for a small country, it would not have been possible to serve as President for such a long period without the daily absolute dedication of the Secretary-General's team. I also thank all the links in the chain which enable us to carry out our functions. I am thinking first of all of the interpreters, whose great merit is that they sometimes succeed in giving meaning to statements that have none. I thank the secretaries, the technicians and all those who ensure that our activities go off smoothly.

I would like to conclude by saying au revoir rather than farewell. It is rather strange for me, in such a short space of time, to come from a warlike organization, NATO. I was deputy permanent representative of Belgium at NATO. The authorities saw fit to appoint me as ambassador for disarmament, and now I have been put in charge of the new NATO department. You see, there is a sort of change, I believe a change in thinking as well. At the time when I joined the Belgian delegation at NATO, the order of the day was more or less "nuke them all". I came to the Conference on Disarmament, where the slogan was "disarm or die", and now I am going back to a decision-making position in NATO. But what I can tell you is that the slogan is no longer "nuke them all" - on the contrary, I think that the end of the cold war and the prospects opening up in a world that may be less stable, but is just as dangerous as it might have been before because of that instability, have changed all that. I think that the experience I have acquired amongst all of you here over the last 19 months will allow me to look at matters with a dash of disarmament which I hope will be of some use for the future of your work. Yet again I thank you all for your kindness and collegial spirit, and as I have said, I hope that this will be an au revoir and not a farewell.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Servais for his kind words to my delegation and I can assure him that as far as modesty is concerned he is also in the running with Ambassador Amorim. I think Ambassador Servais knows quite well that not only will he miss us, but we will all miss him, not only for his outstanding professional skills but also on account of his eternal optimism and his very bright outlook on life. Let us hope that this professional move by Ambassador Servais will truly be a symbol of the balance that can be achieved between the need to guarantee the right to self-defence and the progress which is necessary and indispensable for mankind in these times in the field of disarmament. This at least is the symbol that my delegation sees in his transfer to new duties. Best wishes for success, Ambassador Servais, and all our affection goes with you.

(The President)

The secretariat has distributed today the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the first week of the third part of the annual session of the Conference. The timetable has been prepared in consultation with the chairmen of the subsidiary bodies and is purely indicative. It is subject to change if necessary. If there is no objection I shall take it that the timetable is adopted.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Tomorrow we will conclude the second part of the annual session. The third part will begin on Monday, 26 July, and the next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 29 July at 10 a.m. The plenary meeting stands adjourned.

The meeting rose at 10.35 a.m.

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

CD/PV.657
29 July 1993

ENGLISH

FINAL RECORD OF THE SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY-SEVENTH PLENARY MEETING

Held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Thursday, 29 July 1993, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. José Pérez Novoa (Cuba)

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I declare open the 657th plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament.

On personally taking office as President of the Conference for the period assigned to my country, I would like to reiterate once again our readiness to cooperate closely with all delegations in the discharge of our duties. As you know, for professional reasons related to an official mission outside this city, which could not be postponed, I was not able to make my opening statement when our presidency began on 22 June last. Consequently, I shall now proceed to make this statement.

On 26 July I took up the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament, which for me is a dual source of satisfaction because of the simultaneous commemoration of one more anniversary of the assault on the Moncada barracks, a date that marks the Day of National Rebellion in Cuba.

Before proceeding with my statement I should like to congratulate my colleague, the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China, who preceded me in the Chair, on the excellent way in which he discharged his duties, and to extend my best wishes for success to the Ambassador of Egypt, who will succeed me in this seat during the complicated forthcoming period. I would also like to thank all the delegations that have conveyed kind words to us and have extended their cooperation in discharging our current responsibilities.

My country attaches great importance to this forum and we trust that new disarmament agreements will emerge from it, contributing to consolidating international peace and security. For Cuba, which is currently experiencing a difficult period and whose fundamental priority is to preserve, despite the adversities it faces, the fair social system its people enjoy as a result of the revolution that triumphed in 1959, it is more important than ever to respect the rules and principles of international law and the correct application of the propositions enshrined in the United Nations Charter, to which this forum can make some singular contributions. Refraining from the threat of force and the actual use of force, either unilaterally or collectively, could have been and should be the guiding principles of the international conduct of States in the post-cold-war period. It is therefore regrettable that instead of understanding and dialogue prevailing in all areas, acts of violence have begun to occur with dangerous frequency, which have to do not only with the fratricidal wars that we are witnessing and the violent fragmentation of some States, but also interventionism and interference stemming from the deterioration of the attitude of respect for the principles of national sovereignty. All this creates a growing situation of precariousness for international security and, in particular, that of third world countries. It is no accident that it is the thinking of that illustrious Mexican, Benito Juárez, "Respect for the rights of others is peace", which guards the entry to the hall of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the supreme body - under the United Nations Charter - even though there is currently a temptation to ignore it. It is necessary to think about this in contemplating some of the principal developments of our times, including, inter alia, hostile practices that have not spared my people, which, while subjected to the extension and strengthening of the economic and

(The President)

commercial blockade that has been oppressing it for over 30 years, cannot understand that the plans for the dismantling of foreign military installations reported by the international press should fail to apply to the obsolete foreign military base that usurps part of its territory.

This forum is renewing itself. Not only are distinguished colleagues leaving for new duties, for which we wish them success in their new tasks and their personal lives, while others are joining us, but also consultations are being carried out to expand our current membership and modify our agenda. Both matters are in the excellent hands of the Ambassadors of Australia and Mexico and we urge that the new membership of the Conference should be balanced and representative.

The expectations regarding the first item on our agenda, that of a comprehensive nuclear test ban, marked the beginning of the work of the Conference this year. Recent developments prompt us to think that steps are being taken in the right direction, which we assess at its proper value and we hope that the objective set will be achieved and that this forum will include in the list of its achievements the conclusion of a multilateral nuclear-test-ban treaty. We also hope that possibilities will open up for other "nuclear" items on our agenda, among which that of negative security assurances for non-nuclear States is of special interest. We recognize the importance of the arms control negotiations carried out by the nuclear Powers as a step towards what should be the final objective of any efforts in this regard - the total elimination of this class of weapon through a multilaterally negotiated and verifiable agreement. For our part, we will only reiterate Cuba's decision in respect of its accession, once the rest of the Latin American countries do so, to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, whereby nuclear weapons are banned in our region.

Another item on which delegations in the Conference are focusing is that of transparency in armaments. Many proposals have been made which will be considered in the course of the present meeting. A topic with an important connection with this item is the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms in which my country will participate with the information that in the course of 1992 it neither imported nor exported any of the armaments included therein. As the Minister of Armed Forces of Cuba declared publicly last April, the Ministry is engaged in reducing troop numbers by 30 per cent, which will ensure that Cuba's armed forces are appropriate to its current situation.

The exercise now being carried out in respect of transparency in armaments is of importance within the context of efforts to move forward the process of disarmament and arms control at all levels. Transparency in armaments, it has often been said, is not an end in itself. From our standpoint it should contribute to eliminating the scope for aggression by one State against another, placing emphasis on armaments of an offensive and destabilizing nature which might be used in rapid operations. If transparency and the United Nations register do not bring about a reduction in exports of

(The President)

armaments by the main exporters, the value of the exercise will always be limited. The same reasoning applies to the issues of upgrading and development, especially of weapons of mass destruction.

There is no doubt that this Conference has hard work to do to achieve the objectives set out in its agenda. The disappearance of the confrontation between two political and military blocs and what is known as "deideologization", though some view them as positive elements, are by no means guarantees of real worldwide disarmament and the elimination of the risks facing mankind. Military unipolarity, the present lack of control over nuclear armaments, the continuous sale of arms and transfer of military technology and the growth in new military conflicts - these are all factors that continue to threaten international peace and security.

In conclusion I should like to reiterate that during the period of our presidency we shall remain available to delegations in order to expedite our work and assure them that, as always, we are prompted by the best of intentions.

Thus concludes my opening statement. On the list of speakers for today are the representatives of Chile, the United States of America, Viet Nam, Japan, Australia, Romania, France, Germany, Belarus, India, Mexico and Brazil. I now call on the representative of Chile, Ambassador Tironi.

Mr. TIRONI (Chile) (translated from Spanish): Mr. President, I am pleased to be taking the floor at this first plenary meeting of the third 1993 session of the Conference on Disarmament under your chairmanship.

Firstly, my delegation is pleased to see a representative of a Latin American country with which we are linked by age-old bonds serving as President of the Conference. Furthermore, your professional qualities and diplomatic experience offer us assurances of major progress in this concluding phase of the work of the CD, when important decisions are to be taken, including, inter alia, a decision concerning the subject of expansion. Consequently, we wish to congratulate you and wish you every success in your high office.

I have asked for the floor this morning so as to convey the contents of the following official statement made by the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 13 July of this year.

"The Government of Chile has welcomed, with great satisfaction, the recent announcement by the President of the United States of America of an extension of at least 15 months in the moratorium on underground nuclear testing, as well as the statements made along the same lines by the Governments of France and the Russian Federation. It is confident that all the nuclear States will work together to strengthen this agreement and enhance its influence over time. In this way, in addition to constituting an important step forward towards a worldwide ban on atomic testing, this will favour the creation of a more favourable international climate which will promote confidence among States and

(Mr. Tironi, Chile)

permit sustainable, balanced and peaceful development in all regions of the world. The decision of the United States Government considerably eases the task of the 1995 review conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), particularly because of the impetus it can give to improving the present nuclear non-proliferation regime with a view to enhancing the possibility of extending the NPT well beyond 1995 and ensuring that its provisions are implemented in a more universal scale.

"The Government of Chile trusts that henceforward the agenda of international forums will give greater priority to negotiations designed to lead to the signing of a treaty banning all nuclear testing. It will therefore continue its endeavours to ensure that the United Nations Conference on Disarmament gives priority to consideration of a new treaty as an aspiration which is absolutely realistic and in keeping with the changes that have taken place on the international scene."

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank my esteemed friend the Ambassador of Chile for his statement and the undeserved remarks addressed to us concerning our presidency. Many thanks to the Ambassador of Chile. I now give the floor to the representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Ledogar.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): I have already had occasion to express my delegation's best wishes to the delegation of Cuba for the successful discharge of its responsibilities in the office of the President of the Conference. However, I would like to add or to express my own welcome to our new Belgian colleague who arrived in Geneva after we last met in June. Ambassador Guillaume, you have joined the CD at an important and interesting juncture in its work.

In this regard, President Clinton made a radio address on 3 July to announce that the United States Government had completed an extensive review of its policy on nuclear testing and a comprehensive test ban. As a result of the review, the President decided that the United States will extend the current moratorium on United States nuclear testing at least through September 1994, as long as no other nation tests. He has called on other nuclear-weapon States also to refrain from nuclear testing. We believe that this decision will improve the atmosphere for negotiations on a CTBT and discourage other nations from developing their own nuclear arsenals.

In this regard, President Clinton has placed high priority on beginning negotiations toward a multilateral comprehensive ban on testing of nuclear weapons. We are already undertaking consultations with the other declared nuclear-weapon States as well as other interested States in anticipation that negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty can begin as soon as possible. With the support of other interested States, we hope we can conclude a multilateral CTBT in a timely fashion. Our support for a CTBT reflects the ending of the cold war, as well as our deep concerns about emerging new threats to international security, stemming from proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

The major changes that have occurred in the world have highlighted the need to do our utmost to strengthen international measures against proliferation of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. President Clinton believes that a CTBT could make an important contribution to this effort. In this connection, we are also urging all countries that have not yet become parties to the non-proliferation Treaty to do so, as non-nuclear-weapon States.

The United States believes the nuclear-weapon States have a unique responsibility to establish a new international norm in regard to nuclear testing that would apply equally to all countries, and a special role in negotiations on a CTBT. If we are to achieve a CTBT, all of the nuclear-weapon States need to support this goal on testing. The United States has this in mind, particularly as we consult with the other nuclear-weapon States. At the same time we are also considering how to move toward a multilateral process that will command broad support for a CTBT. We believe the Conference on Disarmament will have an important role to play in this effort.

Let me make clear a few additional points. President Clinton wants to negotiate a multilateral ban on all nuclear-weapons tests. We do not seek another threshold test-ban Treaty. The President considered and rejected the option of proposing a one-kiloton threshold. We are seeking a comprehensive test ban, not a limited or threshold test ban.

On verification, we believe the treaty should include verification measures that ensure confidence without imposing unreasonable burdens or risks for the parties.

This week and next, the CD's Group of Scientific Experts (GSE) is again meeting here in Geneva. Many CD members and non-member participants have been very active in the work of the GSE, developing concepts for an international seismic data exchange. We see an important role for the GSE and its work in the formation of an international CTBT verification regime.

With the full support of the Governments represented in this chamber, and of other interested States, we hope we can conclude a CTBT as quickly as possible. We want to work together to pursue this objective.

I would note that we have circulated as a CD document (CD/1205) the text of President Clinton's 3 July radio address.

Finally, I would like to note for the record the accession by Belarus to the non-proliferation Treaty which occurred on 22 July. This is indeed a welcome event.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of the United States of America for his important statement, which undoubtedly offers hope for the work of this Conference on Disarmament at its forthcoming meetings. I now give the floor to the representative of Viet Nam, Ambassador Nguyen.

Mr. NGUYEN (Viet Nam): Mr. President, speaking for the first time before the Conference this year, at the outset, on behalf of the Vietnamese delegation, I would like to extend to you my warmest congratulations for your assumption of the high post of President of this important Conference for the month of July. I am fully confident that with your experience and diplomatic skills, you will conduct the Conference's deliberations to a most successful conclusion. I sincerely wish to thank your predecessors for the excellent work done, to you and to all members of the Conference for allowing me to take the floor here today.

The interest and demand for disarmament is deep-rooted in the international community's aspirations for peace and security which are prerequisites for and indispensable to the success of the development endeavours of all nations. The Final Document of the first special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament specifies the principal goals of disarmament as being "to ensure the survival of mankind and to eliminate the danger of war, in particular nuclear war, to ensure that war is no longer an instrument for settling international disputes and that the use and the threat of force are eliminated from international life". With those specified goals in mind, looking back to the realities of the past few years, considering those of today, we cannot help seeing both the bright side and the dark side of the disarmament picture in its every dimension. We also cannot help realizing that much remains to be done.

In the recent past the world still witnessed the tension between the two super-Powers, between East and West. With intermediate-range nuclear missiles deployed in both East and West Europe, the danger of an annihilating war was just minutes away. The sword of Damocles was still hanging over the head of mankind. However, the signing of the INF Treaty between the Soviet Union and the United States changed the nuclear disarmament picture by a large measure. Going beyond arms control and arms regulation, the INF Treaty, by providing for the elimination of a whole class of weapons, more importantly nuclear weapons, for the first time made the notion of a disarming world, regarded just years before as a Utopia, a political reality of our times. The conclusion of the START agreements respectively in 1991 and 1992 between the Soviet Union, then Russia, and the United States added bright colour to the picture. With those agreements fully implemented by the year 2003, the numbers of deployed nuclear warheads will be reduced to 3,000-3,500 on each side compared with a total of 50,000 on both sides by the late 1980s. The number of nuclear tests has also decreased substantially with testing moratoriums still in effect in the former Soviet Union, the United States and France. In this connection, the statements of the Russian Federation and the United States on the prolongation of the nuclear test moratorium were indeed another positive step forward in the right direction. All these are positive developments that we have on more than one occasion welcomed and highly

(Mr. Nguyen, Viet Nam)

appraised. However, I have only described the bright side of the nuclear disarmament picture. The other side of the coin remains. For all the reductions that have been made or are to be made, the world still has to live with thousands of nuclear weapons capable of destroying our entire civilization many times over. The danger of an annihilating war has been reduced but not yet eliminated. After all, less insecurity and more security are two different concepts. The nuclear weapon is not just one among many types of weapons. Hiroshima and Nagasaki remind us that we do not have and cannot have security having only thousands of nuclear weapons instead of tens of thousands. Putting aside the effects of radiation, we do not need even 1,000 nuclear weapons to create a "nuclear winter". With transformations in international relations and in the concept of security, it is high time we must get answers to the questions what nuclear deterrence is all about and whether the possession of nuclear weapons does really help protect one's legitimate security interests. Forgetting for now the question of who are right and who are wrong, keeping in mind the highest priority that we continue to attach to nuclear disarmament and to the prevention of nuclear war, the impasse prevailing in the work of the Conference on nuclear issues is depressing. While the reestablishment of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban constitutes a positive step this year, it is urgent that the Conference start serious negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, conclude the negotiations on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and give serious consideration to the need to negotiate a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. In this regard, my delegation deeply regrets that the draft decision of the Group of 21 calling for a start to negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty in the CD has not gained consensus. I believe that any achievement of our deliberations in this connection will have a good impact on the proceedings of the 1995 review and extension conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which we all want to be a success.

The rapid progress in science and technology, while promising us greater opportunities for cooperation in exploring and using outer space for peaceful purposes, makes our task of preventing an arms race in outer space all the more urgent. The existing legal regime governing activities in outer space is inadequate in forestalling an arms race in outer space and in checking the militarization of outer space. We urge the Ad Hoc Committee on the Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space be given a mandate to negotiate further legal instruments to reinforce the regime.

In the field of conventional disarmament, the signing of the Treaty on the reduction of conventional forces in Europe by the countries members of the former Warsaw Pact and NATO, together with unilateral reductions of forces and armaments made by various countries, have been positive developments. However, with tensions still existing or emerging in many parts of the world, much remains to be overcome. That is why Viet Nam completely shares the view expressed by the leaders of the non-aligned countries in the final document of their tenth summit stressing inter alia "the urgency of the need to curb the development and excessive build-up of conventional armaments and all other kinds of armaments, taking into account the legitimate security needs of

(Mr. Nguyen, Viet Nam)

States". We believe that success in the prevention of excessive military build-ups and the destabilizing accumulation of arms depends more on overall confidence in inter-State relations, not just on the provision of information.

If anything has proved the indispensable role of multilateral disarmament endeavours in the post-cold-war period, it is the conclusion of the chemical weapons Convention. We believe that the Convention is a great contribution to international peace, security and the global disarmament process. We do hope that efforts will be made to ensure the Convention is implemented in an effective and fair manner.

Turning to the question of expansion of the membership of the Conference, this question has been on the agenda for more than a decade. Today, with the need for and the trend of globalization of the disarmament process, this question demands an urgent solution. Viet Nam has been on the list of candidates from the beginning and was among the first few. Given its sincere desire to contribute to the work of the Conference and its serious intention, I hope that when the time comes for consideration, Viet Nam will enjoy the strong support of all countries concerned and appropriate priority due to it.

Today the concept of security is a comprehensive one, in which non-military factors such as global economic and trade growth and cooperation, national economic stability and development, good-neighbourliness and regional cooperation and so on are assuming more and more decisive roles. The disarmament policy of Viet Nam is based on this approach and understanding. Within the framework of our all-sided renovation process, and in order to release resources for economic and social development during the past three years, we have cut by nearly half the size of our standing army and reduced substantially our defence budget. With half of our former soldiers now able to live with their families and participate in economic activities, our economic security as well as our social security are enhanced. We have been also pursuing our policy of peace, friendship and cooperation with our neighbours. Besides the normalization of relations with the People's Republic of China, our relations with ASEAN member countries are excellent. If mutual confidence and cooperation are a prerequisite for regional security and prosperity, which in turn contribute to the realization of regional disarmament measures conducive to attaining the final goal of general and complete disarmament, Viet Nam is and will be committed to that end.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Viet Nam for his interesting statement, as well as the kind words addressed to the Chair. Before calling on the next speaker, I wish to correct an omission at the beginning of our work and welcome our colleague from Belgium who has just joined the work of the Conference on Disarmament. We are sure that his extensive diplomatic experience will be a major contribution to our work. We will certainly be in contact, we will enjoy close cooperation. Welcome to the CD. I now give the floor to the representative of Japan, Ambassador Tanaka.

Mr. TANAKA (Japan): Mr. President, since my delegation is taking the floor for the first time under your presidency, let me, at the outset, congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on

(Mr. Tanaka, Japan)

Disarmament and assure you of our full cooperation. I also wish to join other colleagues in welcoming Ambassador Guillaume, the new Belgian representative.

Japan regards the nuclear-test-ban issue as one of the major priorities of nuclear disarmament. Therefore, I feel much honoured to be chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, and pleased with the progress the Committee is making, thanks to the active cooperation rendered by the delegations.

I have taken the floor today to register Japan's appreciation of the decision made by President Clinton of the United States of America to extend its moratorium on nuclear testing at least through September of next year, as long as no other nation tests. The Japanese Government has already announced that it welcomes the United States decision, which contributes to strengthening the international trend toward a comprehensive test ban, and has stated that Japan strongly expects that all other nuclear-weapon States will also exercise self-restraint in nuclear testing. In this context, we welcome the decision by France and the Russian Federation to renew their commitments to the moratoria and their support for a CTB. Indeed we appreciate various initiatives which led to the extended moratoria of today, and would welcome any further positive decisions to be made by other nuclear-weapon States.

As it is Japan's long-standing objective to achieve a comprehensive test ban the Japanese delegation which is currently in the Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban is prepared to make every effort, with the cooperation of our colleagues here, for the Conference on Disarmament to make a timely and important contribution to the accomplishment of a comprehensive test ban. For the purpose of facilitating this process, Japan is planning to host a workshop on NTB verification towards March 1994. Furthermore, I, speaking in my national capacity, should like to propose that the Conference on Disarmament should now consider giving a negotiating mandate to the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban in a timely manner.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Japan for his statement, and for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia, Ambassador O'Sullivan.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): Mr. President, may I join others this morning in welcoming you to the presidency and congratulating you and your delegation on your assumption of your duties and assure you that you will have the full support of my delegation? I would also like at the outset to pay a particular word of welcome to my colleague of former years and now alphabetical neighbour, Ambassador Baron Guillaume of Belgium.

The past three years have introduced profound changes in the political order that was put in place after the end of World War II. Those revolutions of political choice by the people in the former Soviet Union and elsewhere have led, inevitably, to profound changes in strategic perceptions. Former enemies have become welcomed partners in the search for more peaceful and cooperative international arrangements.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Not surprisingly the full implications of such far-reaching and thoroughgoing changes take time to mature. The process of absorbing, appreciating, evaluating and understanding the consequences of those resolutions in political choice is still making its way through the international system. But some consequences are already clear. It is clear that with the change of strategic assumptions goes a change in military doctrine. For instance, the conclusion of the Warsaw Pact and the reorientation of NATO are fully consistent with this changed approach. By extension, the removal of former threats and threat perception is being codified in new and breathtaking agreements that contribute to a more peaceful world at lower levels of armaments: such are the START I and START II agreements and the various associated unilateral decisions of the two major nuclear-weapon States. Australia unambiguously welcomes these developments and extends its congratulations to the United States of America and Russia for the way they have moved in these years to halt the arms race and to embark on an active programme of nuclear disarmament.

Just as the changes in political choices have permitted these major changes in politico-military relations, so they also have their consequences at more precise levels. The question of the utility of nuclear weapons for instance seems ready for reconsideration. So does the argument that nuclear weapons forces need to be modernized. If we are at the start for the first time of a real programme of nuclear disarmament, the idea that a new generation of nuclear weapons should be produced seems particularly bizarre. The question also naturally arises in these circumstances as to the need for any further production of fissile material for nuclear weapons. Since the existing amounts of plutonium and highly enriched uranium are apparently more than adequate for the declining numbers of nuclear weapons, would it not be possible now to codify the cessation of such production in a legally binding instrument that, by including adequate verification arrangements, also reassures the international community that such material is not being covertly produced or acquired?

And most interestingly and importantly, we have the recent extensions of the previously existing moratoria on the testing of nuclear weapons by the United States, Russia and France, and by extension, by the United Kingdom. We note also that although China has not formally announced a moratorium on the testing of nuclear weapons, it has not tested in fact since September 1992. We hope China will soon take the opportunity to join other nuclear-weapon States in formalizing a testing moratorium, and to confirm that it too will adopt a "no first test" policy. Thus, the scene is set for early commencement of negotiations to convert the existing moratoria - whether formally announced or not - into a permanent ban via a treaty of unlimited duration, and in so doing to garner additional non-proliferation benefits for the whole international community.

Australia's Foreign Minister, Senator Evans, has publicly welcomed the decisions of Presidents Clinton, Yeltsin and Mitterrand to continue their existing restraint. Together with the decisions of the United Kingdom and China, this restraint holds out the prospect that 1993 will be the first for

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

many years when there has been no testing of nuclear weapons. This is a result which will be heartily welcomed in Australia and around the world.

I should note in passing that the political climate for the indefinite extension of the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty will be considerably enhanced by the ending of nuclear testing and by the commencement of negotiations for a legally binding, effectively verifiable, universally applicable, multilaterally supported and enduring comprehensive test-ban treaty. Thus, in our view, a CTBT offers significant disarmament and non-proliferation benefits that should be promptly realized.

In this effort, we believe the CD has an essential role. We do not mean to exclude a separate caucussing by the P5. On the contrary we understand why it will be necessary for the former testing Powers to consider together aspects of a test ban, and we acknowledge the significant contribution that will be required from them. We therefore welcome the French proposal for such parallel discussions here in Geneva. But we cannot accept the model of the past when the CD or its predecessors were simply used as the delivery point for a treaty negotiated elsewhere. We see the CTBT as having major benefits because it will stop the continuous evolution of new generations of nuclear weapons - so it will be an effective disarmament measure, and because it will provide effective mechanisms to ensure that States parties are not clandestinely undertaking tests or preparation for testing of nuclear explosive devices - hence it will be an effective instrument and a concrete and symbolic measure of non-proliferation. To obtain these dual benefits, only a multilateral negotiation representing a broad spectrum of international opinion would be a credible forum. Of course, it could in theory be done somewhere else other than in the CD. But the time and effort to create an alternative forum would be onerous, and the result, in our view, unlikely to be better than the CD and quite possibly worse.

In the successful conclusion of the CWC, the CD demonstrated it had the capacity to deliver a high-quality, complex, politically sensitive package which met the declared needs of the international community. Why should we assume it cannot do the same for a CTBT which, after all may not be as technically complex in some respects as was the CWC? For Australia, we think the Conference on Disarmament needs to get down promptly to its work of negotiating a CTBT. We should move expeditiously - I mean during this session - to transform the Group of Scientific Experts into a more active collaborator with us, the negotiators, or if that is not possible to find other appropriate structures. On 24 June, in the NTB Ad Hoc Committee, Mr. Cole of our delegation offered some precise options about how that could be done. We do not have an inflexible or prescriptive approach, but we do want results: we want to draw the useful scientific preparatory work which has been going on patiently for so long into a negotiating context.

We believe preparations should now commence for the formal start of negotiations. I note in passing the comment just made by the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee that Japan also favours the formal start of such negotiations, and we endorse the Chairman's comments. As I mentioned, we recognize that preparation will be needed by the P5, and we urge them to

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

expedite their internal reflection and discussions so that we can all get on with our collective effort. It would also send a useful signal about our determination to make the CD an active negotiating body if we could decide promptly on a negotiating mandate for the Ad Hoc Committee. We would then be in a position to commence negotiations forthwith. We hope that this year's Ad Hoc Committee might continue its work during the available slots between September 1993 and January 1994. Depending on progress, it could work further on developing the integration of seismic and non-seismic verification techniques. We could consider establishing a working group of the AHC on verification, along the model successfully utilized over a number of years in the CWC negotiations. We could also consider a working group on legal and institutional issues. We think that there could be some consideration of who might serve as next year's Chairman of the NTB Ad Hoc Committee.

We think that we should set ourselves the deadline of completing a CTBT by the end of the 1995 CD session, sending the completed text to the UNGA that year and having the treaty open for signature early in 1996. In any event the aim for 1994 should be to produce a largely concluded treaty framework with a largely completed verification package. Such a result would give confidence to the international community that a CTBT could indeed be concluded by the end of the 1995 session, as I have suggested.

After thousands of nuclear tests it seems 1993 will see a decisive break with the pattern of the past 47 years. It is time to codify this long-desired and highly favourable development, to link it to strategically stabilizing benefits and to embody it in an indefinite legal instrument that gives credible assurances of compliance. Such a treaty will be a further demonstration of multilateral cooperation by all those who want a world based on mutual respect, proper regard for legal norms and the increased flow of technology, materials and equipment for peaceful purposes.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Many thanks to the Ambassador of Australia for the important assessment he made in his statement. In turn I also thank him for his kind words concerning our presidency. I now give the floor to the representative of Romania, Ambassador Neagu.

Mr. NEAGU (Romania): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to take the floor under your chairmanship. We all know and appreciate your abilities as a diplomat and skilful negotiator, which will be an important asset for the progress of our endeavours at the Conference. May I use this opportunity to appreciate the diligence with which the distinguished Ambassador of China has conducted the work of the CD in the previous month? I also would like to welcome Ambassador Baron Guillaume, the new representative of Belgium at the Conference.

Romania welcomes the decision of President Clinton of the United States to extend the moratorium on United States nuclear testing at least through September of next year as long as no other nation tests. We are happy to note that the response of other nuclear-weapon States is, in general, prompt and positive. The new American initiative gives the long-expected by the international community answer to ensure the cessation with a view to ban

(Mr. Neagu, Romania)

their nuclear tests. We are especially appreciative of the pledge "to negotiate a comprehensive test ban". The extension of the current moratorium and the organization of consultations and negotiations aimed at concluding a comprehensive treaty of universal vocation open a new vista for the efforts that are made to halt the spread of nuclear technology in weapons and strengthen the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear and other mass destruction weapons and the missiles than can deliver them. This will greatly ease the task of the NPT review conference in 1995 to attain the objective of unconditional and indefinite prolongation of the non-proliferation Treaty. The new American initiative represents also an important contribution to the stimulation of the positive processes in international relations, to the consolidation of stability, security and peace in the world. My country and my delegation at the Conference on Disarmament are ready to join immediately the efforts aimed at negotiating a treaty on the comprehensive cessation of nuclear tests.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (translated from French): As you take up the presidency of the Conference, I wish you every success in your important task and, naturally, assure you of my delegation's full support. I should also like to pay tribute on this occasion to the exemplary fashion in which the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China discharged his duties earlier. Lastly I should like to welcome the Ambassador of Belgium, Ambassador Alain Guillaume, to whom I address my warmest and most friendly wishes for success.

Last 4 July, in a communiqué from the office of the President of the Republic, France stated that it was in favour of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty provided that it was universal and verifiable. It also declared its willingness to participate actively in negotiations to this end. The same communiqué stated that France would at the same time ensure that its deterrent capability would be preserved in the context of progress in technology, and would also see to it that its partners complied with the commitments they had entered into. Today I should like to explain the meaning and the implications of this initiative.

Firstly, it bears witness to France's unswerving resolve to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons; to guarantee at the same time credibility for its deterrent force while complying with the principle of strict sufficiency that it has always abided by. On these two points, France intends to shoulder the responsibilities incumbent on it. As the United Nations Security Council emphasized at its summit meeting on 31 January 1992, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, like the proliferation of the other weapons of mass destruction, constitutes a threat for international peace and security. France is all the more determined to avert this risk since its security, and that of Europe, is particularly concerned. It was with this major concern in mind, and taking into account the incipient process of reductions in the American and Russian arsenals, that France decided in April 1992 to suspend its nuclear testing temporarily and is now ready to negotiate a test-ban treaty. In so doing France is mindful of its security interests. These remain unchanged: today as in the past, the aim is to

(Mr. Errera, France)

guarantee the credibility of its nuclear capability, with the constraints that this involves. For this reason a high-level group of experts was instructed to check that the suspension of testing was not detrimental to our deterrent force. France must take into account simultaneously the level of nuclear capabilities which in any event will remain in the world beyond the year 2000, the risks of proliferation in various parts of the world, and the ability of certain nuclear Powers to exploit their technological lead in order to gain a strategic advantage.

Secondly, it is with these various considerations in mind that France is now addressing the issue of negotiating a nuclear-test-ban treaty. In order to be acceptable, such a treaty should in our view be universal and internationally verifiable. Such a treaty should in the first place be universal: today the only justification for a halt to nuclear testing is to prevent certain countries from making progress in the ambition to acquire nuclear weapons. Consequently, any constraints imposed on the nuclear Powers would be justifiable only if they were applied at one and the same time to everyone, and primarily to the threshold countries. Otherwise - as I have already said in another forum - the legitimate nuclear Powers would find themselves in the absurd position of having to give up their rights while the proliferating countries would continue to pursue their clandestine programmes freely. This treaty should also be internationally verifiable: for the same reason, it is essential that the definitive cessation of testing should be subject to an internationally effective verification regime forming an integral part of the treaty, so as to offer the parties a guarantee that it will be respected. These two reasons make it necessary, in our view, to give the negotiating process a multilateral character from the outset, in order to involve the entire international community in it. The Conference on Disarmament is, in our view, the only possible negotiating forum. It already has this issue before it. It is the repository of expertise in disarmament issues. The five nuclear Powers are represented here. Lastly, it is based on the rule of consensus: as was shown by the negotiations on the chemical weapons Convention, this rule, far from preventing the conclusion of an agreement, facilitates compromise and paves the way to universality. Obviously it will still be possible, as we ourselves had suggested, as the Ambassador of Australia reminded us, for the representatives of the Five in Geneva to consult closely, and for a satisfactory relationship to be sought between the Conference on Disarmament - which will negotiate the treaty - and the five nuclear Powers, consultations among whom, in parallel to the multilateral negotiations, are undoubtedly useful. What is vital in our view is that there should be no separation, either in space or in time, between these two processes which in our view are inseparable. It would be incomprehensible for the nuclear Powers to negotiate a test-ban treaty among themselves alone if the real objective of such a treaty, as we were reminded recently by the representative of Sweden, is no longer so much to put an end to the arms race between two over-armed Powers as to combat the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

For the same reason it would not be any more acceptable or reasonable to delink the negotiation of a treaty from its verification regime, otherwise

(Mr. Errera, France)

verification might become a secondary element, whereas, if our real concern is indeed the risk of proliferation, it must be the key element. It is no insult to anyone to say that we are no longer in 1963, when two States could take the liberty of negotiating the Moscow partial test-ban Treaty and then submitting it to the international community for acceptance. Who can believe that after 146 States have signed the chemical weapons Convention negotiated within the Conference on Disarmament, the international community would agree to be excluded from the negotiations on a nuclear-test-ban treaty which it has been demanding for so many years? How could one justify the Conference on Disarmament, the sole multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, not being the central body for such negotiations?

Thirdly and lastly, it should be clear to all that in the view of my country any future agreement on a halt to testing would make sense and would be acceptable only if the basic conditions which would make it possible were not altered. This means among other things that the undertakings entered into by all concerned should be fully respected, whether we are talking about disarmament or non-proliferation. We have particularly in mind the main instruments which determine and will determine our assessment of the strategic situation, inter alia the ABM Treaty, the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, the START process and of course the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

It has frequently been said in recent months that the Conference on Disarmament was at a crossroads. It would be an understatement to say that this is more true than ever today. The choice is clear. Either the Conference, the only negotiating body on disarmament matters which represents the entire international community, decides now to take on this negotiating process, on the principle of which there is now consensus for the first time, or else the Conference resigns itself to seeing the substance of the negotiations fall outside its grasp, however this may be dressed up. Everyone must weigh the consequences of the decision carefully. France for its part has chosen. It has chosen multilateral negotiations within the Conference on Disarmament. It is aware that these negotiations affect its vital interests and it will, you may be assured, be mindful of the need to defend them and it considers that it will be able to defend them in this forum. France is also aware of how much is at stake - the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons - and will shoulder its responsibilities in this respect.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Errera of France for his interesting statement. I give the floor to the representative of Germany, Ambassador Hoffmann.

Mr. HOFFMANN (Germany): Mr. President, as this is the first time the German delegation takes the floor under your presidency, I should not miss this opportunity to congratulate you upon the assumption of your important task and to wish you good luck and success. We have always appreciated the active role your delegation plays in this Conference. I am convinced that you will lead us efficiently through the beginning of the last part of this year's session, when important decisions on multilateral arms control and the future of the Conference on Disarmament are emerging. I should also like to thank

(Mr. Hoffmann, Germany)

your predecessor, the Chinese Ambassador, for the excellent work he did for this Conference. I would like to wholeheartedly welcome Ambassador Guillaume in our Conference as Belgium has assumed the presidency of the European Community for the second half of this year. I think he will have a lively time with us, especially in New York.

My delegation takes the floor today in order to express the satisfaction of my Government with regard to the recent developments on the issue of a nuclear test ban. We welcome the decision of the United States Government, as explained by my distinguished American colleague just a few minutes ago, to extend the moratorium on nuclear testing, and to commit itself to multilateral negotiations towards a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

It is with equal satisfaction that the German Government takes note of the statements of other nuclear-weapon States on the same issue. In our understanding, none of the nuclear Powers will resume testing first in the foreseeable future, a situation which will create a positive environment for multilateral negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

The German Government attaches great importance to the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty which will have a considerable impact in the realm of nuclear non-proliferation. It is our goal to achieve a universally applicable comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty within the near future. This treaty must be internationally verifiable and its verification provisions should be negotiated together with the substance of the nuclear test ban. We are convinced that the only possible and appropriate forum for negotiating such a treaty is the Conference on Disarmament. The five nuclear Powers carry a special responsibility in the field of nuclear testing. However, in view of the universality of a future treaty we are striving for, all aspects of a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be negotiated in this forum. I therefore agree with the statement of my French colleague we just heard.

The German Government acknowledges the fact that promising future negotiations need solid and substantive preparations. Nevertheless, we think that official negotiations should start in this forum as soon as possible. We believe that the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban, for the time being, should continue its successful work along the lines decided upon earlier this year. However, before the end of this session the Ad Hoc Committee should be in a position to discuss the mandate for future negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Germany for his statement, as well as for the kind words addressed to the Chair. I call on the representative of Belarus, Mr. Sannikov.

Mr. SANNIKOV (Belarus) (translated from Russian): First of all, Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the words of welcome extended to you in the statements by other delegations and wish you success in this crucial period of the Conference's 1993 session.

(Mr. Sannikov, Belarus)

My delegation has taken the floor at today's plenary meeting in order to make a brief informative announcement. But before doing so, I should like to welcome the decision of the Governments of Russia, the United States and France in extending the moratorium on nuclear testing and express the hope that the Conference on Disarmament will be the forum that draws up arrangements for a comprehensive nuclear test ban.

A week ago, on 22 July, the Republic of Belarus submitted its instruments of accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to representatives of the three depositary States of the Treaty: the United Kingdom, Russia and the United States. As you know, the decision on accession to the Treaty was taken by the Belarusian Parliament on 4 February 1993. In this way Belarus was the first of the new independent States of the former USSR to fully discharge its responsibilities under the Lisbon Protocol signed on 23 May 1992. In submitting to the depositaries its instruments of accession to the non-proliferation Treaty, Belarus caused this Treaty to enter into force in respect of its territory. I cannot say that the decisions finally enshrining the nuclear-free status of the Republic were adopted automatically. They were preceded by lively debate and arguments in Parliament and in the press. Various ideas were expressed, including such novel ideas as the establishment of a transitional period as a nuclear-weapon State or the declaration of the status of a "temporary" nuclear State. However, the Republic of Belarus realized that this is first and foremost not a matter of the internal affairs of a State but a fundamental issue of international relations. It was precisely its responsibility for the fate of the Treaty, which is the basis for the international non-proliferation regime, and the understanding of the complex nature of the present period of the Treaty's application and the need to give it unconditional support, that enabled Belarus to take the decisions that I have the honour to communicate to the Conference on Disarmament today.

The President of the United States, B. Clinton, to whom President Shushkevich of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belarus submitted its instruments of accession in Washington, called the decision of the Belarusian Parliament a courageous step and pointed out that Belarus is at the forefront of global efforts to rid mankind of the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Two days ago the Republic of Belarus celebrated the third anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on State Sovereignty. The key provisions of this document concerned the goal of building a non-nuclear, neutral State. The most recent decisions taken by Belarus confirm the consistency of the Republic's policy in pursuing these goals. In this connection I should like to refer to the issue of the expansion of the membership of the Conference. Belarus submitted its official application for membership of the Conference while still a republic of the former Soviet Union. Since then Belarus has demonstrated its commitment to disarmament goals in its practical actions as an independent State. Today, the Republic is a party to all the major international disarmament treaties, including the nuclear treaties signed by the former USSR and the United States. Despite the very difficult period of transformation being experienced by the Republic and serious economic

(Mr. Sannikov, Belarus)

problems, Belarus steadfastly observes the obligations it has assumed. We believe that the concrete contribution made by Belarus to international disarmament efforts gives the Republic every reason to hope to become a fully-fledged member of the Conference in the very near future. We subscribe to the view that in determining the future membership of the Conference various criteria have to be taken into account. However, we believe that the greatest support is due to those States which take a responsible approach to the very complex issues of security and disarmament.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank the representative of Belarus for the information contained in his statement and for the kind words addressed to the Chair.

On the list of speakers I have four countries - India, Mexico, Brazil and Poland. However, I have received a request from the delegation of Russia to make a brief statement with relation to the statement made by the representative of Belarus. If these speakers have no objection, we could call on the delegation of Russia to make its statement. If I hear no objection I shall call on the delegation of Russia.

Mr. ZEMSKOV (Russian Federation) (translated from Russian): Thank you, Mr. President, for your kindness to us. I hope to take exactly two minutes of your time. I must say the following. We welcome the announcement by the Government of the Republic of Belarus of the accession of that State to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as a non-nuclear State. The Russian State and its leadership see in this step an important contribution to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime, a useful and timely example to a number of other States which have yet to make their choice, a choice, we hope, in favour of commonsense and a dependable peace. We are proud that Russia and Belarus closely cooperate with each other, which is already producing positive results in the context of the steps we are taking in the field of nuclear disarmament. We believe that this process is going to continue and develop, thus creating greater certainty among our neighbours, near and far, a predictable and stable strategic situation throughout the Eurasian territory of the former USSR.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): Mr. President, on behalf of the Indian delegation, permit me at the outset to congratulate you upon your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. I am confident that under your wise, capable and dynamic leadership, the Conference will further advance its work. I assure you of the full support of my delegation in accomplishing your duties.

I would also like to avail of this opportunity to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Hou Zhitong of China, for the exemplary manner in which he presided over the earlier meetings of the Conference. I would also like to thank Ambassador Amorim of Brazil, Ambassador Servais of Belgium and Ambassador Batsanov of the Russian Federation, who have left, for their contributions in the CD and to wish them the very best in their new assignments. May I also

(Mr. Chandra, India)

avail of this opportunity to welcome our new colleagues Ambassador Dobrev of Bulgaria, Ambassador Berdennikov of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Saboia of Brazil and Ambassador Guillaume of Belgium?

I would like to confine my remarks today to the comprehensive test-ban treaty. President Clinton's recent announcement extending the United States moratorium on nuclear testing to 30 September 1994 and placing priority on commencing negotiations towards a multilateral comprehensive test-ban treaty has been welcomed by my Government. A comprehensive test-ban treaty has a very important place among all the measures envisaged in the context of nuclear disarmament. Indeed, as one commentator put it, a CTBT is "the most sought-after and most elusive of arms control measures of the nuclear age". In this context, it is also not irrelevant to recall that the first initiative for a ban on nuclear testing was taken by India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, as early as 1954. Since then, India has repeatedly called for cessation of nuclear-weapon testing. In 1988, Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi, while addressing the third special session of the United Nations General Assembly devoted to disarmament, called for a moratorium on testing of all nuclear weapons and initiation of negotiations for a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the first stage for achieving the goal of a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order. Unfortunately, these calls were ignored and the opportunity to cap the proliferation of nuclear weapons was missed.

It has been said that the history of disarmament negotiations is a history of missed opportunities. This is certainly true of the proposal for a ban on all nuclear-weapon test explosions. On at least three occasions during the past 30 years, a test-ban treaty seemed to be imminent: in 1958 when an East-West conference produced a report on the feasibility of detecting nuclear explosions; in 1962-1963, when lack of agreement in the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament on the number of mandatory on-site inspections per year was alleged to be the sole obstacle to a test-ban treaty; and in 1979-1980, when the United Kingdom, United States of America and the former USSR appeared to be making progress towards conclusion of a treaty in their trilateral negotiations. The international political climate today presents a golden opportunity to the international community to put once and for all an end to nuclear-weapon testing. Let it not be said that we have once again failed to seize it. I would therefore like to fully support the proposal made this morning by Ambassadors Tanaka and O'Sullivan that the CD give a negotiating mandate to the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban.

The scope of the comprehensive test-ban treaty we should aim at has been clearly spelt out in the preamble of the PTBT of 1963, which recognized that its objective was to seek to achieve the discontinuance of all tests of nuclear weapons for all times. In our view, therefore, a treaty on nuclear test ban, which would be comprehensive in character, should have three essential characteristics, namely, (i) It should cover all States including the five nuclear-weapon States; (ii) It should extend the prohibition on the testing of nuclear weapons to the underground environment as well; (iii) It should do so for all time. The verification system to be developed must be non-discriminatory in character in the sense of providing equal rights and obligations to the States parties to the proposed treaty including equal

(Mr. Chandra, India)

access. The aim of the CTBT and consequently its scope should be to prevent the testing of nuclear weapons and thereby to inhibit in a non-discriminatory way proliferation of nuclear weapons in their horizontal as well as vertical dimension. It cannot be conceived as an instrument designed to curtail technological progress or to perpetuate the division of the world into two categories of nations. In the promotion of achievement of a nuclear test ban, the interests of the nuclear-weapon States must be taken into account on the basis of complete equality with the interests of the non-nuclear-weapon States.

A compelling reason why CTBT has become a matter of high priority is to prevent the development of "third generation" nuclear weapons. It would, of course, at the same time help reduce the chances of horizontal proliferation. In our view, a comprehensive test-ban treaty would go a long way in arresting the nuclear arms race and bringing to an end the development of more lethal warheads. We hope that all the nuclear-weapon States will respond positively to President Clinton's announcement and engage purposefully in multilateral negotiations for an effective and verifiable comprehensive test-ban treaty, which has long been a goal of international disarmament community. Any limited bilateral or regional approach to this issue which concerns all States would be inappropriate, and, accordingly, a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be negotiated multilaterally.

The START-II agreement signed between the United States and Russia at the beginning of this year, and now the possibility of beginning negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, demonstrates that it is possible to halt and reverse the nuclear arms race with a view to achieving nuclear disarmament. We believe that movement towards such an objective would be facilitated if in future all nuclear-weapon States could also agree to a universal freeze on future development and deployment of nuclear weapons. We also urge all nuclear-weapon States to simultaneously commence negotiations for an agreement to prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We shall continue to work together with other like-minded countries towards establishing a cooperative world order based on a truly non-discriminatory non-proliferation regime on disarmament with the objective of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free world.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Chandra of India for his interesting statement. I now call on my esteemed friend Ambassador Marín of Mexico.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (translated from Spanish): For the delegation of Mexico and for myself personally, it is a source of special satisfaction to see you presiding over this segment of our work. I will not venture to add anything further, since anything I might attempt to say about the historical and current links between Cuba and Mexico would be extremely inadequate. If I attempted to describe the esteem in which we hold you and your delegation, I would also fall short. We are grateful to Ambassador Hou Zhitong for the

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

efforts he made in the previous segment of the work of the CD and we welcome our new colleague from Belgium. We also send his predecessor, Ambassador Michel Servais, every good wish.

On behalf of the member countries of the Group of 21 of the Conference on Disarmament, I should like to make the following statement.

(continued in English)

The G-21 welcomes the statements made by France, the Russian Federation and the United States regarding the extension of their nuclear-testing moratoria. Those announcements, together with the statements made today, are encouraging. The Group of 21 reiterates its readiness to begin at once here, in the Conference on Disarmament, negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty (CTB) that will attract universal adherence and be internationally verifiable.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Many thanks to Ambassador Marín for his kind words addressed to myself and to our delegation and especially for the important statement on behalf of the Group of 21. I now call on Ambassador Saboia of Brazil.

Mr. SABOIA (Brazil): Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to address the plenary of the Conference on Disarmament for the first time. Before delivering my statement, allow me to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference in this important period of our work. Please accept my best wishes, and the assurance of the full support and cooperation of the delegation of Brazil. I would also like to thank the Ambassador of China for the excellent work done as Chairman of the previous session of the Conference. Let me also join other delegations in extending a welcome to the Ambassadors of Belgium, Bulgaria and the Russian Federation who have recently joined the work of the Conference.

I have been instructed to make a statement with regard to the positive development we have witnessed in the past few weeks in relation to the suspension of nuclear tests in certain nuclear-weapon States. While fully endorsing the statement just made by the Ambassador of Mexico on behalf of the Group of 21, I would like to inform the Conference on Disarmament regarding the official reaction of the Brazilian Government to the recent announcement by the United States of America that the nuclear tests would remain suspended in that country at least until September 1994. The following text has been released to the press:

"The Brazilian Government welcomes with special satisfaction the announcement by President Clinton that the United States of America will extend at least until September 1994 the present moratorium on nuclear tests. Brazil urges the other nuclear-weapon States to do likewise and keep the tests suspended. In this sense, the positive steps taken by France and the Russian Federation are also welcome. President Clinton's initiative is an important step in the direction of the multilateral negotiation of a treaty for the complete prohibition of nuclear tests.

(Mr. Saboia, Brazil)

This treaty will be a crucial phase in the process leading to total nuclear disarmament, which remains a permanent goal of Brazilian foreign policy."

Let me also put on record that my Government saw with pleasure the confidence expressed by the American Government on the possibility of an early conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty - a point which has been further elaborated in a statement made at the present meeting by Ambassador Ledogar. For Brazil, the Conference on Disarmament has a central role to play in the negotiation of a CTBT, which should contain indisputable and reliable verification mechanisms. It is the position of the Brazilian Government that the early conclusion of a new international instrument on nuclear tests, equally binding on all countries, will represent an important step towards universality in the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. I note with appreciation the positive statements made by previous speakers to the same effect.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Saboia of Brazil for his important statement and his words addressed to the Chair. I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.

Mr. DEMBINSKI (Poland): Mr. President, let me first extend to you my delegation's congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Conference on Disarmament. You will have my delegation's full cooperation. We also wish to express appreciation to the outgoing President, the Ambassador of China, for the exemplary manner in which he performed his duties. May I also add my welcome to the new representatives, Ambassador Baron Guillaume of Belgium, Ambassador Saboia of Brazil and Ambassador Berdennikov of the Russian Federation?

I have asked for the floor to put on record the profound satisfaction of the Republic of Poland over the further extension of the moratorium on nuclear-weapon tests. President Bill Clinton's decision to "extend the current moratorium on United States nuclear testing at least through September of next year, as long as no other nation tests", President Boris Yeltsin's announcement that "Russia's moratorium will now remain in force as long as the moratoria declared by other nuclear-weapon States are observed", the joint communiqué of President François Mitterrand and M. Balladur that for the time being France would not resume its testing and the concurring positions of China and the United Kingdom - they all indicate the onset of fair weather for the efforts pursued in the Conference on Disarmament to elaborate a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The window of opportunity thus created to make yet another, perhaps decisive step to buttress the non-proliferation regime must not be missed by the international community, in the first place by this body.

In the view of my delegation, owing to the determined efforts of the Conference's subsidiary body - the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban - we are now better prepared than ever to embark on informed, constructive and purpose-oriented efforts toward our long-elusive goal. The series of meetings of the Ad Hoc Committee with the participation of experts, the benefit we all

(Mr. Dembinski, Poland)

had of their learned presentations on diverse aspects of seismic and non-seismic verification techniques and their mutual interrelationship have played an invaluable educational role in better preparing us to deal effectively with the verification issue. We owe gratitude both to the experts and to the delegations which made their expertise available to the Ad Hoc Committee.

In conclusion, let me place on record that my delegation welcomes the important statement of the representatives of the United States and France in which they have expressed their commitment to actively engage in a negotiating process in the Conference on Disarmament leading to early achievement of a CTBT.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The list of speakers I had before me has been completed. However, I wish to ask whether any other delegation wishes to take the floor. I call on the Ambassador of Belgium.

Baron GUILLAUME (Belgium) (translated from French): Mr. President, as you and a number of my colleagues here have been kind enough to welcome me on my arrival in this forum, I would like to thank you for this warm reception. I avail myself of this opportunity to associate myself with all those who have congratulated you on your election to the presidency of this assembly and I wish to assure you of the support of our delegation. For my own part I should like to add that I am well aware of the crucial stage that the Conference on Disarmament has now reached, and I shall do my utmost to make a useful contribution.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): Many thanks to the Ambassador of Belgium and we are sure that his contribution will be very important for the work of the Conference, particularly at this time. As there are no further speakers I should like to turn to another matter. The secretariat has distributed today a request from Cameroon to take part in the work of the Conference. The request appears as an annex to working paper CD/WP.444. No objection has been received to this request. Therefore I suggest that we take it up directly in plenary, on the understanding that this does not signify a precedent in other cases, when requests from non-member States must first be considered in an informal meeting. I note that this arrangement is acceptable and therefore put the request received from Cameroon before the Conference for a decision. If there are no comments I shall take it that the Conference will go along with the recommendation contained in the working paper.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): The secretariat has also distributed today the timetable of meetings to be held by the Conference and its subsidiary bodies during the second week of the third part of the Conference's annual session. The timetable is prepared in consultation with the chairmen of the subsidiary bodies and is merely indicative, and is subject to change if necessary. If there is no objection, I shall take it that the timetable is adopted.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT (translated from Spanish): I should like to inform the members of the Conference that during the informal consultations held on Monday it was agreed that the presidency would get in touch with the Swiss authorities so as to clarify the practical scope of the host country's decision to grant heads of delegation of the Conference on Disarmament the same privileges, immunities and facilities as those granted to the permanent representatives accredited to the United Nations Office at Geneva. I have already been in touch with the authorities and I shall keep the Conference informed of the results of the steps that I shall be taking starting in the next few days.

I have no other matters to deal with and I shall therefore proceed to adjourn this plenary meeting. The next plenary meeting of the Conference on Disarmament will be held on Thursday, 5 August at 10 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.05 p.m.